

31 JAN 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

FROM : Sayre Stevens
Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Personnel Management

REFERENCES : A. MAG Report to the DDCI, dtd 7 Dec 76,
same subject

B. Your memo, dtd 4 Jan 77, Subj: MAG
Report to the DDCI on "Personnel
Management", dtd 7 Dec 76

C. Your memo, dtd 21 Jan 77

1. I have reviewed the MAG Report (Reference A) and the following are thoughts on several of the points as requested in References B and C. In general, while I do not necessarily agree with all of their points, I do believe MAG has presented a thoughtful paper which deserves some further consideration by the Office of Personnel and the EAG.

2. Career Development. MAG makes the point that we need to make better use of the personnel systems we have. I agree with MAG. The DDCI has stressed the importance of the Professional Development Program (PDP) and I believe it is a valuable personnel management tool, yet there is ample evidence that components do not take the exercise as seriously as they should. Many offices, for example, continue to nominate officers for senior internal and external developmental assignments when there is no evidence that the individual is considered to have the potential for assignment to an executive position. Also, we annually rank employees for potential but this information is not used in any systematic way, that I know of, to plan developmental or training programs. I believe more can be done than we are now doing in this important area.

3. MAG further recommends that fitness reports address planned future jobs and training. I think more could be done in this area but we have to recognize that frequently the rating official, and often the reviewer, is not in the best position to discuss future assignments and training. I suggest, therefore, that there may be a better way to accomplish the MAG goal--perhaps using some system such as discussed in para. 2, above.

4. Versatility/Rotation. MAG proposes that there be more rotation at junior grade levels. It has long been an objective of this Directorate to promote rotational assignments at all grade levels when they will enhance the career development of individuals or serve a useful operational purpose. I do not believe a quota system would serve this purpose; but it may be possible to approach the problem more systematically than we now do. For example, I have made this a major responsibility of the recently created position of Directorate Career Development Officer.

5. The proposal for a central rotational career board would not serve a useful purpose in my opinion. While I have established a centralized "Assignments Panel", it is not for the purpose of managing the careers of employees on rotation but to be sure they are given equal consideration for promotion, training, etc. I further believe that a centralized GS-14 promotion panel would be cumbersome and the benefits are not clear.

6. Encouraging Excellence. MAG questions a system that promotes specialists (analysts) to senior grades instead of more flexible employees who can serve as managers. I disagree. There is room for both. The problem has been the need to create unrealistic managerial positions in order to obtain higher grades for senior analysts.

7. MAG proposes we join the other agencies in the elimination of grades GS-08 and GS-10 for junior professionals. I agree. As I understand it, the policy of promoting people one grade at a time was established to slow down the average grade rise of personnel. I am sure this objective has been realized; however, the effect has been to penalize Agency employees. I see no reason for the Agency to depart from the rest of the federal government on this policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2005/07/26 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000200130010-9

8. Office of Personnel Policy. While I do not endorse all of the functions proposed by MAG for the new office, I do believe MAG's proposal that an Office of Personnel Policy be established deserves further discussion. For example, we have an Office of Comptroller to review and establish budget policy--why not a small group to oversee personnel policy? Such a unit, unencumbered by the crush of day-to-day problems of administering the Agency personnel system, might be able to concentrate more on the basic policies that are common to all employees and which underlie the various personnel policies and practices in use throughout the Agency. It should assist Agency management in devising and monitoring policies and mechanisms that foster Agency-wide career identification and development.



Sayre Stevens

STAT